arXiv:1412.6897v2 [math.SP] 15 Apr 2015

LOCAL SPECTRAL ASYMPTOTICS FOR METRIC PERTURBATIONS OF THE LANDAU HAMILTONIAN

TOMÁS LUNGENSTRASS AND GEORGI RAIKOV

Abstract. We consider metric perturbations of the Landau Hamiltonian. We investigate the asymptotic behaviour of the discrete spectrum of the perturbed operator near the Landau levels, for perturbations of compact support, and of exponential or power-like decay at infinity.

AMS 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35P20, 35J10, 47G30, 81Q10

Keywords: Landau Hamiltonian, metric perturbations, position-dependent mass, spectral asymptotics

1. Introduction

Let

$$H_0 := (-i\nabla - A_0)^2,$$

with $A_0 = (A_{0,1}, A_{0,2}) := \frac{b}{2}(-x_2, x_1)$, be the Landau Hamiltonian, self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and essentially self-adjoint on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. In other words, H_0 is the 2D Schrödinger operator with constant scalar magnetic field $b > 0$, i.e. the Hamiltonian of a 2D spinless non relativistic quantum particle subject to a constant magnetic field. As is well known, the spectrum $\sigma(H_0)$ consists of infinitely degenerate eigenvalues $\Lambda_q := b(2q+1)$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$, called *Landau levels* (see e.g. [18, 24]).

In the present article we consider metric perturbations of H_0. Namely, let

$$m(x) = \{m_{jk}(x)\}_{j,k=1,2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2,$$

be a Hermitian 2×2 matrix such that $m(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Throughout the article we assume that $m_{jk} \in C_{\mathrm{b}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $j, k = 1, 2$, i.e. $m_{jk} \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and m_{jk} together with all its derivatives are bounded on $\mathbb{R}^2$. Set

$$\Pi_j := -i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - A_{0,j}, \quad j = 1, 2, \tag{1.1}$$

so that $H_0 = \Pi_1^2 + \Pi_2^2$. On $\operatorname{Dom} H_0$ define the operators

$$H_\pm := \sum_{j,k=1,2} \Pi_j(\delta_{jk} \pm m_{jk})\Pi_k = H_0 \pm W$$

where $W := \sum_{j,k=1,2} \Pi_j m_{jk} \Pi_k$; in the case of H_-, we suppose additionally that $\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} |m(x)| < 1$. Thus the matrices $g_\pm(x) = \left\{g_{jk}^\pm(x)\right\}_{j,k=1,2}$ with $g_{jk}^\pm := \delta_{jk} \pm m_{jk}$ are positive definite for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Under these assumptions, the operators $H_\pm$ are self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and essentially self-adjoint on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ (see the Appendix).

From mathematical physics point of view, the operators $H_\pm$ are special cases of Schrödinger operators with *position-dependent mass* which have been investigated since long ago (see e.g. [5, 37]), but the interest towards which increased essentially during the last decade (see e.g. [27, 19, 23]). Here we would like to mention especially the article [15] where the model considered is quite close to the operators $H_\pm$ discussed in the present paper.

The operators $H_\pm$ admit also a geometric interpretation since they are related to the Bochner Laplacians corresponding to connections with constant non-vanishing curvature (see e.g. [33, 12]); we discuss this relation in more detail at the end of Section 2. Further, assume that

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} m_{jk}(x) = 0, \quad j,k = 1,2. \tag{1.2}$$

Thus m models a localized perturbation with respect to a reference medium. Under condition (1.2) the resolvent difference $H_\pm^{-1} - H_0^{-1}$ is a compact operator (see the Appendix), and therefore the essential spectra of $H_\pm$ and H_0 coincide, i.e.

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(H_\pm) = \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(H_0) = \sigma(H_0) = \bigcup_{q=0}^{\infty} \{\Lambda_q\}\,.$$

The spectrum $\sigma(H_\pm)$ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus \bigcup_{q=0}^\infty \{\Lambda_q\}$ may consist of discrete eigenvalues whose only possible accumulation points are the Landau levels. Moreover, taking into account that $W \geq 0$, and applying [6, Theorem 7, Section 9.4], we find that the eigenvalues of H_+ (resp., H_-) may accumulate to a given Landau level Λ_q only from above (resp., from below). Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $\left\{\lambda_{k,q}^-\right\}$ be the eigenvalues of H_- lying on the interval $(\Lambda_{q-1}, \Lambda_q)$ with $\Lambda_{-1} := -\infty$, counted with the multiplicities, and enumerated in increasing order. Similarly, let $\left\{\lambda_{k,q}^+\right\}$ be the eigenvalues of H_+ lying on the interval $(\Lambda_q, \Lambda_{q+1})$, counted with the multiplicities, and enumerated in decreasing order.

The aim of the article is to investigate the rate of convergence of

$\lambda^{\pm}_{k,q} - \Lambda_q$ as $k \to \infty$, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ being fixed, for perturbations m of compact support, of exponential decay, or of power-like decay at infinity. The properties of the discrete spectrum generated by perturbative second-order differential operators with decaying coefficients have been considered also in [2, 9, 10, 31].

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we formulate our main results, and briefly comment on them. In Section 3 we reduce our analysis to the study of operators of Berezin–Toeplitz type, and in Section 4 we establish several useful unitary equivalences for these operators. Section 5 contains the proofs of our results in the case of rapid decay, i.e. of compact support or exponential decay, while the proofs for slow, i.e. power-like decay, could be found in Section 6. Finally, in the Appendix we address some standard issues concerning the domain of the operators $H_{\pm}$, and the compactness of the resolvent difference $H_0^{-1} - H_{\pm}^{-1}$.

2. Main Results

First, we formulate our results concerning perturbations m of compact support. Denote by $m_<(x)$ and $m_>(x)$ with $m_<(x) \leq m_>(x)$, the two eigenvalues of the matrix $m(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that the support of the matrix m is compact, and its smaller eigenvalue $m_<$ does not vanish identically. Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then we have*

$$\ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda^{\pm}_{k,q} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) = -k\ln k + O(k), \quad k \to \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Remarks: (i) Under additional technical hypotheses on $m_{\gtrless}$, we could make asymptotic relation (2.1) more precise. Namely, assume that there exists a non increasing sequence $\{s_j\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$, such that $s_j > 0$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{j\to\infty} s_j = 0$, and the level lines

$$\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,|\, m_<(x) = s_j\right\}, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

are bounded Lipschitz curves. In particular, the existence of such sequence follows from the Sard lemma (see e.g. [36, Theorem 3.1, Chapter 2]) if we assume that $m_< \in C^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Further, denote by $\mathcal{C}_{\gtrless}$ the *logarithmic capacities* (see e.g. [25, Section 4, Chapter II]) of $\operatorname{supp} m_{\gtrless}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(1 + \ln\left(b\mathcal{C}_<^2/2\right)\right)k + o(k) \leq \\ \ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda^{\pm}_{k,q} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) + k\ln k \leq \left(1 + \ln\left(b\mathcal{C}_>^2/2\right)\right)k + o(k)\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

as $k \to \infty$. We omit the details of the proof of (2.2), inspired by [17].
(ii) For $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\lambda > 0$, set

$$\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda) := \#\left\{k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid \pm\left(\lambda_{k,q}^{\pm} - \Lambda_q\right) > \lambda\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Then a less precise version of (2.1), namely

$$\ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda_{k,q}^{\pm} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) = -k\ln k\,(1 + o(1)), \quad k \to \infty,$$

is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda) = \frac{|\ln\lambda|}{\ln|\ln\lambda|}(1 + o(1)), \quad \lambda \downarrow 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Further, we state our results concerning perturbations of exponential decay. Assume that there exist constants $\beta > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\ln m_{\gtrless}(x) = -\gamma|x|^{2\beta} + O(\ln|x|), \quad |x| \to \infty. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark: In (2.5), we suppose that the values of γ and β are the same for $m_<$ and $m_>$. Of course, the remainder $O(\ln|x|)$ could be different for $m_<$ and $m_>$.

Given $\beta > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$, set $\mu := \gamma(2/b)^{\beta}$, $b > 0$ being the constant magnetic field.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $m_{\gtrless}$ satisfy (2.5). Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.*
(i) *If $\beta \in (0,1)$, then there exist constants $f_j = f_j(\beta,\mu)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, with $f_1 = \mu$, such that*

$$\ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda_{k,q}^{\pm} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) = -\sum_{1 \le j < \frac{1}{1-\beta}} f_j k^{(\beta-1)j+1} + O(\ln k), \quad k \to \infty. \tag{2.6}$$

(ii) *If $\beta = 1$, then*

$$\ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda_{k,q}^{\pm} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) = -\left(\ln(1+\mu)\right)k + O(\ln k), \quad k \to \infty. \tag{2.7}$$

(iii) *If $\beta \in (1,\infty)$, then there exist constants $g_j = g_j(\beta,\mu)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, such that*

$$\ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda_{k,q}^{\pm} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) = -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}k\ln k \tag{2.8}$$
$$+\left(\frac{\beta - 1 - \ln(\mu\beta)}{\beta}\right)k - \sum_{1 \le j < \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} g_j k^{(\frac{1}{\beta}-1)j+1} + O(\ln k), \quad k \to \infty.$$

Remarks: (i) Let us describe explicitly the coefficients f_j and g_j, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, appearing in (2.6) and (2.8) respectively. Assume at first $\beta \in (0,1)$. For $s > 0$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\epsilon| << 1$, introduce the function

$$F(s;\epsilon) := s - \ln s + \epsilon\mu s^{\beta}. \tag{2.9}$$

Denote by $s_<(\epsilon)$ the unique positive solution of the equation $s = 1 - \epsilon\beta\mu s^\beta$, so that $\frac{\partial F}{\partial s}(s_<(\epsilon);\epsilon) = 0$. Set

$$f(\epsilon) := F(s_<(\epsilon);\epsilon). \tag{2.10}$$

Note that f is a real analytic function for small $|\epsilon|$. Then $f_j := \frac{1}{j!}\frac{d^j f}{d\epsilon^j}(0)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let now $\beta \in (1,\infty)$. For $s > 0$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $|\epsilon| << 1$, introduce the function

$$G(s;\epsilon) := \mu s^\beta - \ln s + \epsilon s. \tag{2.11}$$

Denote by $s_>(\epsilon)$ the unique positive solution of the equation $\beta\mu s^\beta = 1 - \epsilon s$ so that $\frac{\partial G}{\partial s}(s_>(\epsilon);\epsilon) = 0$. Define

$$g(\epsilon) := G(s_>(\epsilon);\epsilon), \tag{2.12}$$

which is a real analytic function for small $|\epsilon|$. Then $g_j := \frac{1}{j!}\frac{d^j g}{d\epsilon^j}(0)$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

(ii) If, instead of (2.5), we assume that

$$\ln m_{\gtrless}(x) = -\gamma|x|^{2\beta}(1+o(1)), \quad |x| \to \infty, \tag{2.13}$$

then we can prove less precise versions of (2.6), (2.7), and (2.8), namely

$$\ln\left(\pm\left(\lambda^\pm_{k,q} - \Lambda_q\right)\right) = \begin{cases} -\mu k^\beta(1+o(1)) & \text{if} \quad \beta \in (0,1), \\ -\left(\ln(1+\mu)\right) k(1+o(1)) & \text{if} \quad \beta = 1, \\ -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta} k \ln k\,(1+o(1)) & \text{if} \quad \beta \in (1,\infty), \end{cases} \qquad k \to \infty,$$

which are equivalent to

$$\mathcal{N}^\pm_q(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \mu^{-1/\beta}|\ln\lambda|^{1/\beta}(1+o(1)) & \text{if} \quad \beta \in (0,1), \\ \frac{1}{\ln(1+\mu)}|\ln\lambda|(1+o(1)) & \text{if} \quad \beta = 1, \\ \frac{\beta}{\beta-1}\frac{|\ln\lambda|}{\ln|\ln\lambda|}(1+o(1)) & \text{if} \quad \beta \in (1,\infty), \end{cases} \qquad \lambda \downarrow 0. \tag{2.14}$$

Note that in (2.13), similarly to (2.5), we assume that the values of γ and β are the same for $m_<$ and $m_>$. However, since the coefficient in (2.14) with $\beta > 1$ does not depend on γ, in this case we could assume different values of $\gamma > 0$ for $m_<$ and $m_>$.

Finally, we consider perturbations m which admit a power-like decay at infinity. For $\rho > 0$ recall the definition of the Hörmander class

$$\mathcal{S}^{-\rho}(\mathbb{R}^2) := \left\{\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2) \,|\, |D^\alpha\psi(x)| \le c_\alpha\langle x\rangle^{-\rho-|\alpha|},\ x \in \mathbb{R}^2,\ \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^2_+\right\},$$

where $\langle x\rangle := (1+|x|^2)^{1/2}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy $\lim_{|x|\to\infty}\psi(x) = 0$. Set

$$\Phi_\psi(\lambda) := \left|\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \,|\, \psi(x) > \lambda\right\}\right|, \quad \lambda > 0, \tag{2.15}$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes the Lebesgue measure. Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and introduce the function

$$\mathcal{T}_q(x) := \frac{1}{2}\left(\Lambda_q \mathrm{Tr}\, m(x) - 2b\,\mathrm{Im}\, m_{12}(x)\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.16}$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}_q(x) \geq 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $m_{jk} \in \mathcal{S}^{-\rho}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $j,k = 1,2$, with $\rho > 0$. Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Suppose that there exists a function $0 < \tau_q \in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)$, such that*

$$\lim_{|x|\to\infty} |x|^\rho \mathcal{T}_q(x) = \tau_q(x/|x|).$$

Then we have

$$\mathcal{N}_q^\pm(\lambda) = \frac{b}{2\pi}\Phi_{\mathcal{T}_q}(\lambda)(1 + o(1)) \asymp \lambda^{-2/\rho}, \quad \lambda \downarrow 0, \tag{2.17}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0} \lambda^{2/\rho}\mathcal{N}_q^\pm(\lambda) = \mathcal{C}_q := \frac{b}{4\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \tau_q(\cos\theta, \sin\theta)^{2/\rho} d\theta, \tag{2.18}$$

or to

$$\pm\left(\lambda_{k,q}^\pm - \Lambda_q\right) = \mathcal{C}_q^{\rho/2} k^{-\rho/2}(1 + o(1)), \quad k \to \infty. \tag{2.19}$$

Remarks: (i) Relation (2.17) could be regarded as a semiclassical one, although here the semiclassical interpretation is somewhat implicit. In Propositions 4.1 and 4.3 below, we show that the effective Hamiltonian which governs the asymptotics of $\mathcal{N}_q^\pm(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ is a pseudo-differential operator (ΨDO) with anti-Wick symbol $w_{q,b} := w_q \circ \mathcal{R}_b$, defined by (4.8) and (4.31). Under the assumptions of Theorem 2.3, $\mathcal{T}_{q,b} := \mathcal{T}_q \circ \mathcal{R}_b$ (see (2.16) and (4.31)) can be considered as the principal part of the symbol $w_{q,b}$, while the difference between the anti-Wick and the Weyl quantization is negligible. Then $\frac{1}{2\pi}\Phi_{\mathcal{T}_{q,b}}(\lambda) = \frac{b}{2\pi}\Phi_{\mathcal{T}_q}(\lambda)$ is just the main semiclassical asymptotic term for the eigenvalue counting function for a compact ΨDO with Weyl symbol $\mathcal{T}_{q,b}$.
(ii) There exists an extensive family of alternative sets of assumptions for Theorem 2.3 (see e.g. [22, 14]). We have chosen here hypotheses which, for certain, are not the most general ones, but are quite explicit and, hopefully, easy to absorb.

Let us comment briefly on our results. Nowadays, there exists a relatively wide literature on the local spectral asymptotics for various magnetic quantum Hamiltonians. Let us concentrate here on three types of perturbations of H_0 which are considered to be of a particular interest (see e.g. [22, 26]):

- Electric perturbations $H_0 + Q$ where $Q : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ plays the role of the perturbative *electric potential*;
- Magnetic perturbations $(-i\nabla - A_0 - A)^2$ where $A = (A_1, A_2)$, and $B := \frac{\partial A_2}{\partial x_1} - \frac{\partial A_1}{\partial x_2}$ is the perturbative *magnetic field*;
- Metric perturbations $\sum_{j,k=1,2} \Pi_j \left(\delta_{jk} + m_{jk}\right) \Pi_k$ where $m = \{m_{jk}\}_{j,k=1,2}$ is an appropriate perturbative matrix-valued function.

Typically, the perturbations Q, B, or m are supposed to decay in a suitable sense at infinity. Slowly decaying Q, e.g. $Q \in \mathcal{S}^{-\rho}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with $\rho > 0$ were considered in [30], and the main asymptotic terms of the corresponding counting functions $\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ were found, utilizing, in particular, anti-Wick ΨDOs . In [22, Theorem 11.3.17], the case of *combined* electric, magnetic, and metric slowly decaying perturbations was investigated, the main asymptotic terms of $\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$, as well as certain remainder estimates were obtained. The semiclassical microlocal analysis applied in [22] imposed restrictions on the symbols involved which, in some sense or another, had to decay at infinity less rapidly than their derivatives. These restrictions did not allow to handle some rapidly decaying perturbations, e.g. those of compact support, or of exponential decay with $\beta \geq 1/2$ (see (2.5)).
In [32] the authors used a different approach based on the spectral analysis of Berezin–Toeplitz operators and obtained the main asymptotic terms of $\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ in the case of potential perturbations Q of exponential decay or of compact support. In particular, in [32] formulas of type (2.4) or (2.14) appeared for the first time. In the present article, we essentially improve the methods developed in [32]. These improvements lead also to more precise results for certain rapidly decaying electric perturbations. Namely, assume that $Q \geq 0$ admits a decay at infinity which is compatible in a suitable sense with the decay of m. Then the results of the article extend quite easily to operators of the form

$$H_{\pm} \pm Q, \tag{2.20}$$

so that $H_{\pm} \pm Q$ are perturbations of H_0 having a definite sign. We do not include these generalizations just in order to avoid an unreasonable increase of the size of the article due to results which do not require any really new arguments.
Combined perturbations of H_0 by compactly supported B and Q were considered in [34] where the main asymptotic terms of $\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ were found. Note that the magnetic perturbations of H_0 are never of fixed sign which creates specific difficulties, successfully overcome in

[34].
To authors' best knowledge, no results on the spectral asymptotics for rapidly decaying *metric* perturbations of H_0 appeared before in the literature. We also included in the article our result on slowly-decaying metric perturbations (see Theorem 2.3) since it is coherent with the unified approach of the article, and is proved by methods quite different from those in [22].
Finally, let us discuss briefly the relation of $H_\pm$ to the Bochner Laplacians. Assume that the elements of m are real. In $\mathbb{R}^2$ introduce a Riemannian metric generated by the inverse of $g^\pm$, and the connection 1-form $\sum_{j=1,2} A_{0,j} dx_j$. Set $\gamma_\pm := (\det g^\pm)^{-1/2}$. Then the standard Bochner Laplacian, self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \gamma_\pm dx)$, is written in local coordinates as

$$\mathcal{L}_\pm := -\gamma_\pm^{-1} \sum_{j,k=1,2} \Pi_j g_{jk}^\pm \gamma_\pm \Pi_k.$$

Let $U_\pm : L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \gamma_\pm dx) \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; dx)$ be the unitary operator defined by $U_\pm f := \gamma_\pm^{-1/2} f$. Then we have

$$U_\pm \mathcal{L}_\pm U_\pm^* = H_\pm + Q_\pm \tag{2.21}$$

where

$$Q_\pm := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j,k=1,2} \left(g_{jk}^\pm \frac{\partial \ln \gamma_\pm}{\partial x_k} \frac{\partial \ln \gamma_\pm}{\partial x_j} - 2 \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \left(g_{jk}^\pm \frac{\partial \ln \gamma_\pm}{\partial x_k} \right) \right).$$

Generally speaking, the functions $Q_\pm$ do not have a definite sign coinciding with the sign of the operators $H_\pm - H_0$; hence, the operators on the r.h.s of (2.21) are not exactly of the form of (2.20). The fact that the symbol of a Toeplitz operator does not have a definite sign may cause considerable difficulties in the study of the spectral asymptotics of this operator if the symbol decays rapidly and, in particular, when its support is compact (see e.g. [29]). Hopefully, we will overcome these difficulties in a future work where we would consider the local spectral asymptotics of $\mathcal{L}_\pm$.

3. Reduction to Berezin-Toeplitz Operators

In this section we reduce the analysis of the functions $\mathcal{N}_q^\pm(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ to the spectral asymptotics for certain compact operators of Berezin-Toeplitz type. To this end, we will need some more notations, and several auxiliary results from the abstract theory of compact operators in Hilbert space.
In what follows, we denote by $\mathbb{1}_M$ the characteristic function of the set

M. Let T be a self-adjoint operator in a Hilbert space[1], and $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval. Set

$$N_{\mathcal{I}}(T) := \operatorname{rank} \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I}}(T),$$

where, in accordance with our general notations, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{I}}(T)$ is the spectral projection of T corresponding to $\mathcal{I}$. Thus, if $\mathcal{I} \cap \sigma_{\mathrm{ess}}(T) = \emptyset$, then $N_{\mathcal{I}}(T)$ is just the number of the eigenvalues of T, lying on $\mathcal{I}$, and counted with their multiplicities. In particular,

$$\mathcal{N}_q^-(\lambda) = N_{(\Lambda_{q-1}, \Lambda_q - \lambda)}(H_-), \quad q \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad \lambda \in (0, 2b), \tag{3.1}$$

$$\mathcal{N}_q^+(\lambda) = N_{(\Lambda_q + \lambda, \Lambda_{q+1})}(H_+), \quad q \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad \lambda \in (0, 2b), \tag{3.2}$$

the functions $\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}$ being defined in (2.3). Let $T = T^*$ be a linear compact operator in a Hilbert space. For $s > 0$ set

$$n_{\pm}(s; T) := N_{(s,\infty)}(\pm T);$$

thus, $n_+(s;T)$ (resp., $n_-(s;T)$) is just the number of the eigenvalues of the operator T larger than s (resp., smaller than $-s$), counted with their multiplicities. If $T_j = T_j^*$, $j = 1, 2$, are two linear compact operators, acting in a given Hilbert space, then the Weyl inequalities

$$n_{\pm}(s_1 + s_2; T_1 + T_2) \le n_{\pm}(s_1; T_1) + n_{\pm}(s_2; T_2) \tag{3.3}$$

hold for $s_j > 0$ (see e.g. [6, Theorem 9, Section 9.2]).
Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and denote by P_q the orthogonal projection onto $\operatorname{Ker}(H_0 - \Lambda_q)$. Since the operator $H_0^{-1} W H_0^{-1}$ is compact, the operator $P_q W P_q = \Lambda_q^2 P_q H_0^{-1} W H_0^{-1} P_q$ is compact as well. Similarly, the operators $H_0^{-1} W H_{\pm}^{-1/2}$ are compact, and hence the operators

$$P_q W H_{\pm}^{-1} W P_q = \Lambda_q^2 P_q (H_0^{-1} W H_{\pm}^{-1/2})(H_{\pm}^{-1/2} W H_0^{-1}) P_q$$

are compact as well.

Proposition 3.1. *Under the general assumptions of the article we have*

$$n_+((1+\varepsilon)\lambda; P_q W P_q \mp P_q W H_{\pm}^{-1} W P_q) + O(1) \le$$

$$\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda) \le \tag{3.4}$$

$$n_+((1-\varepsilon)\lambda; P_q W P_q \mp P_q W H_{\pm}^{-1} W P_q) + O(1), \quad \lambda \downarrow 0,$$

for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

[1]All the Hilbert spaces considered in the article are supposed to be separable.

Proof. The argument is close in spirit to the proof of [32, Proposition 4.1], and is based again on the (generalized) Birman–Schwinger principle. However, since the operator $H_0^{-1/2} W H_0^{-1/2}$ is only bounded but not compact, we cannot apply the Birman–Schwinger principle to the operator pair $(H_0, H_\pm)$, and apply it instead to the resolvent pair $(H_0^{-1}, H_\pm^{-1})$. First of all, note that there exist Λ_- and Λ_+ with $\Lambda_- \in (0, \Lambda_0)$ if $q = 0$, $\Lambda_- \in (\Lambda_{q-1}, \Lambda_q)$ if $q \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\Lambda_+ \in (\Lambda_q, \Lambda_{q+1})$ if $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, such that

$$\mathcal{N}_q^-(\lambda) = N_{(\Lambda_-, \Lambda_q - \lambda)}(H_-), \quad \lambda \in (0, \Lambda_q - \Lambda_-), \tag{3.5}$$

$$\mathcal{N}_q^+(\lambda) = N_{(\Lambda_q + \lambda, \Lambda_+)}(H_+), \quad \lambda \in (0, \Lambda_+ - \Lambda_q). \tag{3.6}$$

Further, evidently,

$$N_{(\Lambda_-, \Lambda_q - \lambda)}(H_-) = N_{((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1}, \Lambda_-^{-1})}(H_-^{-1}) = N_{((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1}, \Lambda_-^{-1})}(H_0^{-1} + T_-), \tag{3.7}$$

$$N_{(\Lambda_q + \lambda, \Lambda_+)}(H_+) = N_{(\Lambda_+^{-1}, (\Lambda_q + \lambda)^{-1})}(H_+^{-1}) = N_{(\Lambda_+^{-1}, (\Lambda_q + \lambda)^{-1})}(H_0^{-1} - T_+), \tag{3.8}$$

with $T_- := H_-^{-1} - H_0^{-1}$ and $T_+ := H_0^{-1} - H_+^{-1}$. Note that the operators $T_\pm$ are non negative and compact. By the generalized Birman–Schwinger principle (see e.g. [3, Theorem 1.3]) we have

$$\begin{aligned} N_{((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1}, \Lambda_-^{-1})}(H_0^{-1} + T_-) &= n_+(1; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1} T_-^{1/2}) \\ &\quad - n_+(1; T_-^{1/2}(\Lambda_-^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1} T_-^{1/2}) \\ &\quad - \dim \operatorname{Ker}(H_- - \Lambda_-), \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

$$\begin{aligned} N_{(\Lambda_+^{-1}, (\Lambda_q + \lambda)^{-1})}(H_0^{-1} - T_+) &= n_+(1; T_+^{1/2}(H_0^{-1} - (\Lambda_q + \lambda)^{-1})^{-1} T_+^{1/2}) \\ &\quad - n_+(1; T_+^{1/2}(H_0^{-1} - \Lambda_+^{-1})^{-1} T_+^{1/2}) \\ &\quad - \dim \operatorname{Ker}(H_+ - \Lambda_+). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Since the operators $T_\pm$ are compact, and $\Lambda_\pm \notin \sigma(H_0)$, we find that the two last terms on the r.h.s. of (3.9) and (3.10) which are independent of λ, are finite. Next, the Weyl inequalities (3.3) imply

$$\begin{aligned} &n_+(1 + \varepsilon; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1} P_q T_-^{1/2}) \\ &\quad - n_-(\varepsilon; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1}(I - P_q) T_-^{1/2}) \le \\ &\qquad n_+(1; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1} T_-^{1/2}) \le \\ &\qquad n_+(1 - \varepsilon; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1} P_q T_-^{1/2}) \\ &\qquad\quad + n_+(\varepsilon; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q - \lambda)^{-1} - H_0^{-1})^{-1}(I - P_q) T_-^{1/2}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. The operator $T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}-H_0^{-1})^{-1}(I-P_q)T_-^{1/2}$ tends in norm as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ to the compact operator

$$T_-^{1/2}\left(\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_+\setminus\{q\}}(\Lambda_q^{-1}-\Lambda_j^{-1})^{-1}P_j\right)T_-^{1/2}.$$

Therefore,

$$n_\pm(\varepsilon; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}-H_0^{-1})^{-1}(I-P_q)T_-^{1/2}) = O(1), \quad \lambda\downarrow 0, \tag{3.12}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Next, for any $s>0$ we have

$$n_+(s; T_-^{1/2}((\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}-H_0^{-1})^{-1}P_qT_-^{1/2}) = \tag{3.13}$$
$$n_+(s; ((\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}-\Lambda_q^{-1})^{-1}T_-^{1/2}P_qT_-^{1/2}) = n_+(s\lambda(\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}\Lambda_q^{-1}; P_qT_-P_q).$$

Hence, (3.9) and (3.11) - (3.13) yield

$$n_+((1+\varepsilon)\lambda(\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}\Lambda_q^{-1}; P_qT_-P_q)+O(1) \le$$

$$N_{((\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1},\Lambda_-^{-1})}(H_0^{-1}+T_-) \le$$

$$n_+((1-\varepsilon)\lambda(\Lambda_q-\lambda)^{-1}\Lambda_q^{-1}; P_qT_-P_q)+O(1), \quad \lambda\downarrow 0, \tag{3.14}$$

for any $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$. Similarly, (3.10) and the analogues of (3.11) - (3.13) for positive perturbations, imply

$$n_+((1+\varepsilon)\lambda(\Lambda_q+\lambda)^{-1}\Lambda_q^{-1}; P_qT_+P_q)+O(1) \le$$

$$N_{(\Lambda_+^{-1},(\Lambda_q+\lambda)^{-1})}(H_0^{-1}-T_+) \le$$

$$n_+((1-\varepsilon)\lambda(\Lambda_q+\lambda)^{-1}\Lambda_q^{-1}; P_qT_+P_q)+O(1), \quad \lambda\downarrow 0. \tag{3.15}$$

By the resolvent identity, we have $T_\pm = H_0^{-1}WH_0^{-1} \mp H_0^{-1}WH_\pm^{-1}WH_0^{-1}$, so that

$$P_qT_\pm P_q = \Lambda_q^{-2}(P_qWP_q \mp P_qWH_\pm^{-1}WP_q).$$

Thus,

$$n_+(s; P_qT_\pm P_q) = n_+(s\Lambda_q^2; P_qWP_q \mp P_qWH_\pm^{-1}WP_q), \quad s>0. \tag{3.16}$$

Putting together (3.5) – (3.8) and (3.14) – (3.16), we easily obtain (3.4). □

4. Unitary Equivalence for Berezin-Toeplitz Operators

Our first goal in this section is to show that under certain regularity conditions on the matrix m, the operator P_qWP_q, $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, with domain $P_qL^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, is unitarily equivalent to $P_0w_qP_0$ with domain $P_0L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where w_q is the multiplier by a suitable function $w_q : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$. In fact, we will need a slightly more general result, and that is why we introduce at first the appropriate notations.
As usual, for $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we set $z := x_1 + ix_2$ and $\overline{z} := x_1 - ix_2$ so that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} - i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \overline{z}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + i\frac{\partial}{\partial x_2}\right).$$

Introduce the magnetic annihilation operator

$$a := -2ie^{-b|x|^2/4}\frac{\partial}{\partial \overline{z}}e^{b|x|^2/4} = -2i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \overline{z}} + \frac{bz}{4}\right),$$

and the magnetic creation operator

$$a^* := -2ie^{b|x|^2/4}\frac{\partial}{\partial z}e^{-b|x|^2/4} = -2i\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z} - \frac{b\overline{z}}{4}\right),$$

with common domain $\operatorname{Dom} a = \operatorname{Dom} a^* = \operatorname{Dom} H_0^{1/2}$. The operators a and a^* are closed and mutually adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. On $\operatorname{Dom} H_0$ we have $[a, a^*] = 2b$ and

$$H_0 = a^*a + b = aa^* - b = \frac{1}{2}(aa^* + a^*a). \tag{4.1}$$

Moreover, on $\operatorname{Dom} H_0^{1/2}$ we have

$$\Pi_1 = \frac{1}{2}(a + a^*), \quad \Pi_2 = \frac{1}{2i}(a - a^*), \tag{4.2}$$

the operators Π_j, $j = 1, 2$, being introduced in (1.1). Next, define the operator $\mathbb{A} : \operatorname{Dom} H_0^{1/2} \to L^2(\mathbb{R}^2; \mathbb{C}^2)$ by

$$\mathbb{A}u := \begin{pmatrix} a^*u \\ au \end{pmatrix}, \quad u \in \operatorname{Dom} H_0^{1/2}.$$

Then, (4.1) implies that $H_0 = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{A}^*\mathbb{A}$. Further, introduce the Hermitian matrix-valued function

$$\Omega := \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{11} & \omega_{12} \\ \omega_{21} & \omega_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\omega_{jk} \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $j, k = 1, 2$. Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and define the operator

$$P_q\mathbb{A}^*\Omega\mathbb{A}P_q = \Lambda_qP_qH_0^{-1/2}\mathbb{A}^*\Omega\mathbb{A}H_0^{-1/2}P_q, \tag{4.3}$$

bounded and self-adjoint in $P_qL^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Utilizing (4.2), we easily find that

$$P_qWP_q = \frac{1}{2}P_q\mathbb{A}^*U\mathbb{A}P_q \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$U := \mathcal{O}^*m\mathcal{O}, \quad \mathcal{O} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ i & -i \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.5}$$

so that $U = \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, with

$$u_{11} := \frac{1}{2}\left(\operatorname{Tr} m - 2\operatorname{Im} m_{12}\right), \quad u_{22} := \frac{1}{2}\left(\operatorname{Tr} m + 2\operatorname{Im} m_{12}\right),$$

$$u_{12} = \overline{u_{21}} := \frac{1}{2}\left(m_{11} - m_{22} - 2i\operatorname{Re} m_{12}\right).$$

Introduce the Laguerre polynomials

$$\mathrm{L}_q^{(m)} := \sum_{j=0}^{q}\binom{q+m}{q-j}\frac{(-t)^j}{j!}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad q \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+; \tag{4.6}$$

as usual, we write $\mathrm{L}_q^{(0)} = \mathrm{L}_q$, and for notational convenience we set $q\mathrm{L}_{q-1} = 0$ for $q = 0$. By [21, Eq. 8.974.3] we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{q}\mathrm{L}_j^{(m)}(t) = \mathrm{L}_q^{(m+1)}(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad q \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.7}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let Ω be a Hermitian 2×2 matrix-valued function with entries $\omega_{jk} \in C_{\mathrm{b}}^{\infty}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $j, k = 1, 2$. Fix $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then the operator $P_q\mathbb{A}^*\Omega\mathbb{A}P_q$ with domain $P_qL^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, is unitarily equivalent to the operator $P_0w_qP_0$ with domain $P_0L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ where*

(4.8)

$$w_q = w_q(\Omega) := \begin{cases} 2b(q+1)\mathrm{L}_{q+1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\omega_{11} + 2bq\mathrm{L}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\omega_{22} \\ \qquad\qquad -8\operatorname{Re}\mathrm{L}_{q-1}^{(2)}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\frac{\partial^2\omega_{12}}{\partial\overline{z}^2} \quad \text{if} \quad q \geq 1, \\ 2b\mathrm{L}_1\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\omega_{11} \quad \text{if} \quad q = 0, \end{cases}$$

Δ is the standard Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^2$ so that, in accordance with (4.6), $\mathrm{L}_s^{(m)}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)$ with $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, is just the differential operation $\sum_{j=0}^{s}\binom{s+m}{s-j}\frac{\Delta^j}{j!(2b)^j}$ of order $2s$ with constant coefficients.

Proof. Set

$$\varphi_{0,k}(x) := \sqrt{\frac{b}{2\pi k!}}\left(\frac{b}{2}\right)^{k/2}z^ke^{-b|x|^2/4}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+,$$

$$\varphi_{q,k}(x) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{(2b)^q q!}}(a^*)^q \varphi_{0,k}(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad q \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then $\{\varphi_{q,k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}$ is an orthonormal basis of $P_q L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ called sometimes *the angular momentum basis* (see e.g. [32] or [11, Subsection 9.1]). Evidently, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have

(4.9)

$$a^*\varphi_{q,k} = \sqrt{2b(q+1)}\varphi_{q+1,k}, \quad q \in \mathbb{Z}_+, \quad a\varphi_{q,k} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{2bq}\varphi_{q-1,k}, & q \geq 1, \\ 0, & q = 0. \end{cases}$$

Define the unitary operator $\mathcal{W} : P_q L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \to P_0 L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by $\mathcal{W} : u \mapsto v$ where

$$u = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} c_k \varphi_{q,k}, \quad v = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} c_k \varphi_{0,k}, \quad \{c_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \in \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+). \tag{4.10}$$

We will show that

$$P_q \mathbb{A}^* \Omega \mathbb{A} P_q = \mathcal{W}^* P_0 w_q P_0 \mathcal{W}. \tag{4.11}$$

For $V \in C_{\mathrm{b}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $m, s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, and $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, set

$$\Xi_{m,s}(V; k, \ell) := \langle V\varphi_{m,k}, \varphi_{s,\ell}\rangle$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the scalar product in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Taking into account (4.9) and (4.10), we easily find that

$$\langle P_q \mathbb{A}^* \Omega \mathbb{A} P_q u, u\rangle =$$

$$2b \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \left((q+1)\Xi_{q+1,q+1}(\omega_{11}; k, \ell) + q\Xi_{q-1,q-1}(\omega_{22}; k, \ell)\right) c_k\overline{c_\ell} +$$

$$2b\sqrt{q(q+1)}2\mathrm{Re} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Xi_{q+1,q-1}(\omega_{21}; k, \ell) c_k\overline{c_\ell}, \tag{4.12}$$

if $q \geq 1$, and

$$\langle P_0 \mathbb{A}^* \Omega \mathbb{A} P_0 u, u\rangle = 2b \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Xi_{1,1}(\omega_{11}; k, \ell) c_k\overline{c_\ell}. \tag{4.13}$$

Moreover,

$$\langle P_0 w_q P_0 v, v\rangle = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \sum_{\ell\in\mathbb{Z}_+} \Xi_{0,0}(w_q; k, \ell) c_k\overline{c_\ell}, \quad q \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.14}$$

In [11, Lemma 9.2] (see also the remark after Eq.(2.2) in [7]), it was shown that

$$\Xi_{m,m}(V; k, \ell) = \Xi_{0,0}\left(\mathrm{L}_m\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right) V; k, \ell\right), \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.15}$$

Now (4.13), (4.15) with $m = 1$ and $V = \omega_{11}$, and (4.14) with $q = 0$, imply (4.11) in the case $q = 0$. Assume $q \geq 1$. By (4.15), we have

$$\Xi_{q+1,q+1}(\omega_{11}; k, \ell) = \Xi_{0,0}\left(\mathrm{L}_{q+1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\omega_{11}; k, \ell\right), \tag{4.16}$$

$$\Xi_{q-1,q-1}(\omega_{22}; k, \ell) = \Xi_{0,0}\left(\mathrm{L}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\omega_{22}; k, \ell\right). \tag{4.17}$$

Let us now consider the quantity $\Xi_{q+1,q-1}(V; k, \ell)$. Using (4.9), we easily find that for $q \geq 2$ we have

(4.18)

$$\Xi_{q+1,q-1}(V; k, \ell) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2b(q+1)}}\Xi_{q,q-1}([V, a^*]; k, \ell) + \sqrt{\frac{q-1}{q+1}}\Xi_{q,q-2}(V; k, \ell),$$

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi_{q,q-1}([V, a^*]; k, \ell) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2bq}}&\Xi_{q-1,q-1}([[V, a^*], a^*]; k, \ell) \\ &+ \sqrt{\frac{q-1}{q}}\Xi_{q-1,q-2}([V, a^*]; k, \ell).\end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

Moreover, $[V, a^*] = 2i\frac{\partial V}{\partial z}$, and

$$[[V, a^*], a^*] = -4\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2}. \tag{4.20}$$

Using (4.19), it is not difficult to prove by induction that

$$\Xi_{q,q-1}([V, a^*]; k, \ell) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2bq}}\sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\Xi_{j,j}([[V, a^*], a^*]; k, \ell), \quad q \geq 1. \tag{4.21}$$

Now (4.15), (4.20), and (4.7) imply

$$\sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\Xi_{j,j}([[V, a^*], a^*]; k, \ell) = \sum_{j=0}^{q-1}\Xi_{0,0}\left(-4\mathrm{L}_j\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2}; k, \ell\right) =$$

$$\Xi_{0,0}\left(-4\mathrm{L}^{(1)}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial z^2}; k, \ell\right). \tag{4.22}$$

Setting

$$\mathcal{D}_q := -4\mathrm{L}^{(1)}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}, \quad q \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.23}$$

we find that (4.21) and (4.22) imply

$$\Xi_{q,q-1}([V, a^*]; k, \ell) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2bq}}\Xi_{0,0}\left(\mathcal{D}_q V; k, \ell\right). \tag{4.24}$$

Bearing in mind (4.18), (4.15), and (4.24), it is not difficult to prove by induction that

$$\Xi_{q+1,q-1}(V;k,\ell)=\frac{1}{2b\sqrt{q(q+1)}}\sum_{s=1}^{q}\Xi_{0,0}\left(\mathcal{D}_sV;k,\ell\right). \tag{4.25}$$

Note that (4.7) and (4.25) imply

$$\sum_{s=1}^{q}\mathcal{D}_s=-4\mathrm{L}_{q-1}^{(2)}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2}. \tag{4.26}$$

Now, (4.25) and (4.26) entail

(4.27)

$$2b\sqrt{q(q+1)}\Xi_{q+1,q-1}(\omega_{21};k,\ell)=\Xi_{0,0}\left(-4\mathrm{L}_{q-1}^{(2)}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\frac{\partial^2\omega_{21}}{\partial z^2};k,\ell\right).$$

Finally, (4.12) and (4.14) combined with (4.16), (4.17), and (4.27), yield (4.11) with $q\geq 1$. □

In the rest of the section we establish two other suitable representations for the operators P_qVP_q, $q\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, with $V:\mathbb{R}^2\to\mathbb{C}$.

Proposition 4.2. (i) [16, Lemma 3.1], [7, Subsection 2.3] *Let $V\in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfy $\lim_{|x|\to\infty}V(x)=0$. Then for each $q\in\mathbb{Z}_+$ the operator P_qVP_q is compact.*

(ii) [32, Lemma 3.3] *Assume in addition that V is radially symmetric, i.e. there exists $v:[0,\infty)\to\mathbb{C}$ such that $V(x)=v(|x|)$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$. Then the eigenvalues of the operator P_qVP_q with domain $P_qL^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, counted with the multiplicities, coincide with the set*

$$\left\{\langle V\varphi_{q,k},\varphi_{q,k}\rangle\right\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}_+}. \tag{4.28}$$

In particular, the eigenvalues of P_0VP_0 coincide with

$$\frac{1}{k!}\int_0^\infty v((2t/b)^{1/2})e^{-t}t^k dt,\quad k\in\mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{4.29}$$

Remarks: (i) Let us recall that if f is, say, a bounded function of exponential decay, then

$$(\mathcal{M}f)(z):=\int_0^\infty f(t)t^{z-1}dt,\quad z\in\mathbb{C},\quad \mathrm{Re}\,z>0,$$

is called sometimes *the Mellin transform* of f. Some of the asymptotic properties as $k\to\infty$ of the integrals (4.29) which we will later obtain and use in the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and 2.2, could possibly be deduced from the general theory of the Mellin transform.

(ii) Combining Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, we find that if the matrix-valued function Ω is radially symmetric and diagonal, then the

operator $P_q\mathbb{A}^*\Omega\mathbb{A}P_q$ acting in $P_qL^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is unitarily equivalent to a *diagonal* operator in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$. If Ω is just radially symmetric, then $P_q\mathbb{A}^*\Omega\mathbb{A}P_q$ is unitarily equivalent to a *tridiagonal* operator acting in $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_+)$.

The last proposition in this section concerns the unitary equivalence between the Berezin-Toeplitz operator P_0WP_0 and a certain Weyl pseudo-differential operator (ΨDO). Let us recall the definition of Weyl ΨDOs acting in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Denote by $\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the set of functions $\psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$\|\psi\|_{\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)} := \sup_{(y,\eta)\in\mathbb{R}^2} \sup_{\ell,m=0,1} \left| \frac{\partial^{\ell+m}\psi(y,\eta)}{\partial y^\ell \partial \eta^m} \right| < \infty.$$

Then the operator $\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi)$ defined initially as a mapping between the Schwartz class $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ and its dual class $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ by

$$\left(\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi)u\right)(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \psi\left(\frac{y+y'}{2},\eta\right) e^{i(y-y')\eta}u(y')dy'd\eta, \quad y\in\mathbb{R},$$

extends uniquely to an operator bounded in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, there exists a constant c such that

$$\|\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi)\| \le c\|\psi\|_{\Gamma(\mathbb{R}^2)} \tag{4.30}$$

(see e.g. [8, Corollary 2.5(i)]).
Remark: Inequalities of type (4.30) are known as *Calderón-Vaillancourt* estimates.

Put

$$\mathcal{R}_b := -b^{-1/2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.31}$$

and for $V : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{C}$, define

$$V_b(x) := V\left(\mathcal{R}_b x\right), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^2, \quad b>0.$$

Moreover, set $\mathcal{G}(x) := \frac{e^{-|x|^2}}{\pi}$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$.

Proposition 4.3. [28, Theorem 2.11, Corollary 2.8] *Let $V \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) + L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then the operator P_0VP_0 with domain $P_0L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is unitarily equivalent to the operator $\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(V_b * \mathcal{G})$.*

Remark: The operator $\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi) := \mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi * \mathcal{G})$ is called ΨDO with *anti-Wick symbol* ψ (see e.g. [35, Section 24]).

5. Proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2

In this section we complete the proofs of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, concerning perturbations of compact support, and of exponential decay.

Let $T = T^*$ be a compact operator in a Hilbert space, such that $\operatorname{rank} \mathbb{1}_{(0,\infty)}(T) = \infty$. Denote by $\{\nu_k(T)\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ the non-increasing sequence of the positive eigenvalues of T, counted with the multiplicities. Recall that $m_<(x) \leq m_>(x)$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix $m(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Since the matrix U (see (4.5)) is unitarily equivalent to m, $m_{\gtrless}$ are also the eigenvalues of U. Next, we check that Proposition 3.1 implies the following

Corollary 5.1. *Under the general assumptions of the article, there exist constants $0 < c_<^{\pm} \leq c_>^{\pm} < \infty$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that*

$$c_<^{\pm}\nu_{k+k_0}(P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_<\mathbb{A}P_q) \leq \pm(\lambda_{k,q}^{\pm} - \Lambda_q) \leq c_>^{\pm}\nu_{k-k_0}(P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}P_q) \tag{5.1}$$

for sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. It is easy to see that

$$0 \leq P_qWH_{\pm}^{-1}WP_q \leq c_{\pm}P_qWP_q \tag{5.2}$$

with

$$c_{\pm} := \|H_{\pm}^{-1/2}WH_{\pm}^{-1/2}\| \leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} |m(x)(I \pm m(x))^{-1}|.$$

Note that $0 \leq c_- < \infty$ and $0 \leq c_+ < 1$. Moreover, by (4.4) and the mini-max principle,

$$n_+(2s; P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_<\mathbb{A}P_q) \leq n_+(s; P_qWP_q) \leq n_+(2s; P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}P_q), \quad s > 0. \tag{5.3}$$

Now, (3.4), (5.2), and (5.3), imply that for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ we have

$$\begin{gathered} n_+(2\lambda(1+\varepsilon); P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_<\mathbb{A}P_q) + O(1) \leq \\ \mathcal{N}_q^-(\lambda) \leq \\ n_+(2\lambda(1-\varepsilon); (1+c_-)P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}P_q) + O(1), \end{gathered} \tag{5.4}$$

$$\begin{gathered} n_+(2\lambda(1+\varepsilon); (1-c_+)P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_<\mathbb{A}P_q) + O(1) \leq \\ \mathcal{N}_q^+(\lambda) \leq \\ n_+(2\lambda(1-\varepsilon); P_q\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}P_q) + O(1), \end{gathered} \tag{5.5}$$

as $\lambda \downarrow 0$, and estimates (5.4) - (5.5) yield (5.1) with

$$c_<^- = \frac{1}{2(1+\varepsilon)}, \quad c_>^- = \frac{1+c_-}{2(1-\varepsilon)}, \quad c_<^+ = \frac{1-c_+}{2(1+\varepsilon)}, \quad c_>^+ = \frac{1}{2(1-\varepsilon)},$$

and sufficiently large $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$. □

Let us now complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $\zeta_1 \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\zeta_1 \geq 0$, $\zeta_1 = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} m_>$. Set $\zeta_2(x) := (\max_{y\in\mathbb{R}^2} m_>(y))\,\zeta_1(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Evidently, $m_> \leq \zeta_2$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$, so that

$$\nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^* m_> \mathbb{A} P_q) \leq \nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^*\zeta_2\mathbb{A}P_q), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.6}$$

Further, by Proposition 4.1, the operator $P_q\mathbb{A}^*\zeta_2\mathbb{A}P_q$ is unitarily equivalent to the operator $P_0\zeta_3 P_0$ where

$$\zeta_3 := 2b\left((q+1)\mathrm{L}_{q+1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right) + q\mathrm{L}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\right)\zeta_2.$$

Therefore,

$$\nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^*\zeta_2\mathbb{A}P_q) = \nu_k(P_0\zeta_3 P_0), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.7}$$

Let $R_> > 0$ be so large that the disk $B_{R_>}(0)$ of radius $R_>$, centered at the origin contains the support of ζ_3. Then,

$$\nu_k(P_0\zeta_3 P_0) \leq \max_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2}|\zeta_3(x)|\,\nu_k(P_0\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_>}(0)}P_0), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.8}$$

Putting together (5.6), (5.7), and (5.8), we find that there exists a constant $K_> < \infty$ such that

$$\nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^* m_> \mathbb{A} P_q) \leq K_>\nu_k(P_0\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_>}(0)}P_0), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.9}$$

On the other hand,

$$\nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^* m_< \mathbb{A} P_q) \geq \nu_k(P_q a\, m_<\, a^* P_q). \tag{5.10}$$

Applying (4.9), we easily find that the operators $P_q a\, m_< a^*\, P_q$ and $2b(q+1)P_{q+1}\, m_<\, P_{q+1}$ are unitarily equivalent. Hence,

$$\nu_k(P_q a m_< a^* P_q) = 2b(q+1)\nu_k(P_{q+1}m_<P_{q+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.11}$$

Further, since $m_<$ is non-negative, continuous, and does not vanish identically, there exist $c_0 > 0$, $R_< \in (0,\infty)$, and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, such that $m_<(x) \geq c_0\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(x_0)}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Therefore,

$$\nu_k(P_{q+1}m_<P_{q+1}) \geq c_0\nu_k(P_{q+1}\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(x_0)}P_{q+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.12}$$

The operators $P_{q+1}\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(x_0)}P_{q+1}$ and $P_{q+1}\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(0)}P_{q+1}$ are unitarily equivalent under the magnetic translation which maps x_0 into 0 (see e.g. [32, Eq. (4.21)]). Therefore,

$$\nu_k(P_{q+1}\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(x_0)}P_{q+1}) = \nu_k(P_{q+1}\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(0)}P_{q+1}), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.13}$$

Combining (5.10) - (5.13), we find that there exists a constant $K_<$ such that

$$K_<\,\nu_k(P_{q+1}\mathbb{1}_{B_{R_<}(0)}P_{q+1}) \leq \nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^* m_< \mathbb{A} P_q), \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.14}$$

By (5.9) and (5.14), it remains to study the asymptotic behaviour as $k \to \infty$ of $\nu_k(P_m\mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)}P_m)$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $R \in (0,\infty)$ being fixed.

This asymptotic analysis relies on the representation (4.28), and results sufficient for our purposes, are available in the literature. Namely, we have

Lemma 5.2. [13, Section 4, Corollary 2] *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $R \in (0,\infty)$, $b \in (0,\infty)$. Set $\varrho := bR^2/2$. Then*

$$\nu_k(P_m \mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)} P_m) = \frac{e^{-\varrho}\varrho^{-m+1}k^{2m-1}\varrho^k}{m!\,k!}(1+o(1)), \quad k\to\infty. \tag{5.15}$$

Now, asymptotic relation (2.1) follows from (5.1), (5.9), (5.14), (5.15), and the elementary fact that $\ln k! = k\ln k + O(k)$ as $k\to\infty$.

In the remaining part of this section we prove Theorem 2.2 concerning perturbations m of exponential decay. Assume that m satisfies (2.5). Then there exist $\delta_{\gtrless}\in\mathbb{R}$, $\delta_< \le \delta_>$, and $r>1$, such that

$$|x|^{\delta_<} e^{-\gamma|x|^{2\beta}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^2\setminus B_r(0)}(x) \le m_<(x) \le \tag{5.16}$$

$$m_>(x) \le |x|^{\delta_>} e^{-\gamma|x|^{2\beta}} \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^2\setminus B_r(0)}(x) + \max_{y\in\mathbb{R}^2} m_>(y)\mathbb{1}_{B_r(0)}(x), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^2.$$

Let $\eta_{\gtrless,0}\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2;[0,1])$ be two radially symmetric functions such that $\eta_{<,0}=1$ on $\mathbb{R}^2\setminus B_{r+1}(0)$, $\eta_{<,0}=0$ on $B_r(0)$, and $\eta_{>,0}=1$ on $\mathbb{R}^2\setminus B_r(0)$, $\eta_{>,0}=0$ on $B_{r-1}(0)$. For $x\in\mathbb{R}^2$ set

$$\eta_{<,1}(x) := |x|^{\delta_<} e^{-\gamma|x|^{2\beta}} \eta_{<,0}(x),$$

$$\eta_{>,1}(x) := |x|^{\delta_>} e^{-\gamma|x|^{2\beta}} \eta_{>,0}(x) + \max_{y\in\mathbb{R}^2} m_>(y)(1-\eta_{<,0}(x)).$$

Evidently, $\eta_{\gtrless,1}\in C^\infty_{\mathrm{b}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and by (5.16),

$$\eta_{<,1}(x) \le m_<(x), \quad m_>(x)\le \eta_{>,1}(x), \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^2.$$

Therefore, for $k\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^* m_< \mathbb{A} P_q) &\ge \nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^*\eta_{<,1}\mathbb{A}P_q),\\ \nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^* m_> \mathbb{A} P_q) &\le \nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^*\eta_{>,1}\mathbb{A}P_q). \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Further, set

$$\eta_{\gtrless,2} := 2b\left((q+1)\mathrm{L}_{q+1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right) + q\mathrm{L}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{\Delta}{2b}\right)\right)\eta_{\gtrless,1}.$$

According to Proposition 4.1, the operators $P_q\mathbb{A}^*\eta_{\gtrless,1}\mathbb{A}P_q$, $q\in\mathbb{Z}_+$, and $P_0\eta_{\gtrless,2}P_0$ are unitarily equivalent. Therefore,

$$\nu_k(P_q\mathbb{A}^*\eta_{\gtrless,1}\mathbb{A}P_q) = \nu_k(P_0\eta_{\gtrless,2}P_0), \quad k\in\mathbb{Z}_+. \tag{5.18}$$

Next, a tedious but straightforward calculation shows that

$$\eta_{\gtrless,2}(x) = \eta_{\gtrless,3}(x)(1+o(1)), \quad |x|\to\infty, \tag{5.19}$$

where

$$\eta_{\gtrless,3}(x) := C_{q,\beta}|x|^{\delta_\gtrless} e^{-\gamma|x|^{2\beta}} \begin{cases} 1 \quad \text{if } \beta \in (0,1/2], \\ |x|^{2(q+1)(2\beta-1)} \quad \text{if } \beta \in (1/2,\infty), \end{cases} \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^2 \backslash \{0\},$$

and $C_{q,\beta} > 0$ are some constants. Even though the exact values of $C_{q,\beta}$ will not play any role in the sequel, we indicate here these values for the sake of the completeness of the exposition:

$$C_{q,\beta} = \begin{cases} 2\Lambda_q \quad \text{if} \quad \beta \in (0,1/2), \\ 2b\left((q+1)\mathrm{L}_{q+1}\left(-\frac{(2\beta\gamma)^2}{2b}\right) + q\mathrm{L}_{q-1}\left(-\frac{(2\beta\gamma)^2}{2b}\right)\right) \quad \text{if} \quad \beta = 1/2, \\ \frac{(2\beta\gamma)^{2(q+1)}}{(2b)^q q!} \quad \text{if} \quad \beta \in (1/2,\infty). \end{cases}$$

Hence, by (5.19), there exists $R \in (0,\infty)$ such that for $x \in \mathbb{R}^2$ we have

$$\eta_{<,2} \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta_{<,3}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^2\backslash B_R(0)} - c_<\mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)} =: \eta_{<,4}(x), \tag{5.20}$$

$$\eta_{>,2} \leq \frac{3}{2}\eta_{>,3}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^2\backslash B_R(0)} + c_>\mathbb{1}_{B_R(0)} =: \eta_{>,4}(x), \tag{5.21}$$

with $c_\gtrless := \max_{y\in\mathbb{R}^2}|\eta_{\gtrless,2}(y)|$. Thus, for any admissible $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ we have

$$\nu_k(P_0\eta_{<,2}P_0) \geq \nu_k(P_0\eta_{<,4}P_0), \quad \nu_k(P_0\eta_{>,2}P_0) \leq \nu_k(P_0\eta_{>,4}P_0). \tag{5.22}$$

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 2.2, we need a couple of auxiliary results. For $\beta > 0$, $\mu > 0$, and $\varrho > 0$, set

$$\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k) := \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t^\beta - t} t^k dt, \quad \mathcal{E}_\varrho(k) := \int_0^\varrho e^{-t} t^k dt, \quad k > -1, \tag{5.23}$$

and for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $c_0 > 0$ and $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$, put

$$\mathcal{L}(k) = \mathcal{L}_{\beta,\mu,\varrho,\delta}(k; c_0, c_1) := \frac{c_0\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta) + c_1\mathcal{E}_\varrho(k-\delta_-)}{\Gamma(k+1)}, \qquad k > \max\{-1, -\delta - 1\},$$

where $\delta_- := \max\{0, -\delta\}$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\beta > 0$, $\mu > 0$, $\varrho > 0$, $c_0 > 0$, and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$, $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$.*
(i) *The asymptotic relations*

$$\ln \mathcal{L}(k) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{1\leq j<\frac{1}{1-\beta}} f_j k^{(\beta-1)j+1} + O(\ln k) \quad \text{if} \quad \beta \in (0,1), \\ -\left(\ln(1+\mu)\right) k + O(\ln k) \quad \text{if} \quad \beta = 1, \\ -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta} k \ln k + k\left(\frac{\beta-1-\ln(\mu\beta)}{\beta}\right) \\ \qquad -\sum_{1\leq j<\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} g_j k^{(\frac{1}{\beta}-1)j+1} + O(\ln k) \quad \text{if} \quad \beta \in (1,\infty), \end{cases} \tag{5.24}$$

hold true as $k \to \infty$, the coefficients f_j and g_j being introduced in the statement of Theorem 2.2.
(ii) *We have $\mathcal{L}'(k) < 0$ for sufficiently large k.*

Proof. Let at first $\delta = 0$. Assume $\beta \in (0,1)$, $k > 0$, and change the variable $t \mapsto ks$ in the first integral in (5.23). Thus we find that

$$\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k) = k^{k+1} \int_0^\infty e^{-kF(s;k^{\beta-1})} ds. \tag{5.25}$$

The function $F(s;k^{\beta-1})$ defined in (2.9), attains its unique minimum at $s_<(k^{\beta-1})$, and we have $\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial s^2}(s_<(k^{\beta-1});k^{\beta-1}) = 1 + o(1)$, $k \to \infty$. Therefore, applying a standard argument close to the usual Laplace method for asymptotic evaluation of integrals depending on a large parameter, we easily find that

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-kF(s;k^{\beta-1})} ds = (2\pi)^{1/2} e^{-kF(s_<(k^{\beta-1});k^{\beta-1})} k^{-1/2}(1+o(1)), \quad k \to \infty. \tag{5.26}$$

Bearing in mind that $F(s_<(k^{\beta-1});k^{\beta-1}) = f(k^{\beta-1})$ (see (2.10)), $f(0) = 1$, and

$$\ln \Gamma(k+1) = k \ln k - k + \frac{1}{2} \ln k + O(1), \quad k \to \infty, \tag{5.27}$$

(see e.g. [1, Eq. 6.1.40]), we find that (5.25) – (5.26) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k)}{\Gamma(k+1)} \right) &= k - kf(k^{\beta-1}) + O(\ln k) \\ &= k - k \sum_{0 \le j < \frac{1}{1-\beta}} \frac{1}{j!} \frac{d^j f}{d\epsilon^j}(0) k^{(\beta-1)j} + O(\ln k) \\ &= - \sum_{1 \le j < \frac{1}{1-\beta}} \frac{1}{j!} \frac{d^j f}{d\epsilon^j}(0) k^{(\beta-1)j+1} + O(\ln k) \\ &= - \sum_{1 \le j < \frac{1}{1-\beta}} f_j k^{(\beta-1)j+1} + O(\ln k), \quad k \to \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{5.28}$$

In the case $\beta = 1$, we simply have

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k)}{\Gamma(k+1)} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(k+1)} \int_0^\infty e^{-(\mu+1)t} t^k dt = (\mu+1)^{-k-1},$$

i.e.

$$\ln \left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k)}{\Gamma(k+1)} \right) = -(\ln(1+\mu))k + O(1), \quad k \to \infty. \tag{5.29}$$

Let now $\beta \in (1,\infty)$. Changing the variable $t \mapsto k^{1/\beta}s$ with $k>0$ in (5.23), we find

$$\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k) := k^{(k+1)/\beta}\int_0^\infty e^{-kG(s;k^{(\frac{1}{\beta}-1)})}ds. \tag{5.30}$$

The function $G(s;k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1})$ defined in (2.11), attains its unique minimum at $s_>(k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1})$, and we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 G}{\partial s^2}(s_>(k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1}),k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1}) = \beta(\mu\beta)^{2/\beta}(1+o(1)), \quad k\to\infty.$$

Arguing as in the derivation of (5.26), we obtain

$$\int_0^\infty e^{-kG(s;k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1})}ds = \sqrt{2\pi\beta}\,(\mu\beta)^{-1/\beta}e^{-kG(s_>(k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1});k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1})}k^{-1/2}(1+o(1)), \quad k\to\infty. \tag{5.31}$$

Bearing in mind that $G(s_>(k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1});k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1}) = g(k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1})$ (see (2.12)), and $g(0)=\frac{1+\ln(\mu\beta)}{\beta}$, we find that (5.30), (5.31), and (5.27), imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k)}{\Gamma(k+1)}\right) &= -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}k\ln k + k - kg(k^{\frac{1}{\beta}-1}) + O(\ln k)\\
&= -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}k\ln k + k - k\sum_{0\le j<\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}\frac{1}{j!}\frac{d^j g}{d\epsilon^j}(0)k^{(\frac{1}{\beta}-1)j} + O(\ln k)\\
&= -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}k\ln k + k(1-g(0)) - \sum_{1\le j<\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}}\frac{1}{j!}\frac{d^j g}{d\epsilon^j}(0)k^{(\frac{1}{\beta}-1)j+1} + O(\ln k)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= -\frac{\beta-1}{\beta}k\ln k + k\left(\frac{\beta-1-\ln(\mu\beta)}{\beta}\right) - \sum_{1\le j<\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} g_j k^{(\frac{1}{\beta}-1)j+1} + O(\ln k), \tag{5.32}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Let us now consider general $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$. By (5.27),

$$\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma(k+\delta+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)}\right) = \delta\ln k + O(1), \quad k\to\infty. \tag{5.33}$$

Putting together (5.28), (5.29), (5.32), and (5.33), we find that

$$\ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta)}{\Gamma(k+1)}\right) - \ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k)}{\Gamma(k+1)}\right) = O(\ln k), \quad k\to\infty. \tag{5.34}$$

Finally, by (5.15), we easily find that for each $\delta\in\mathbb{R}$ fixed, we have

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}_\varrho(k-\delta_-)}{\Gamma(k+1)} = o\left(\frac{\mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta)}{\Gamma(k+1)}\right), \quad k\to\infty. \tag{5.35}$$

The combination of (5.28), (5.29), (5.32), (5.34), and (5.35) implies (5.24).
(ii) We have

$$\mathcal{L}'(k) =$$

$$c_0 \left(\frac{\mathcal{J}'_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta)}{\Gamma(k+1)} - \frac{\Gamma'(k+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)^2} \mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta) \right) +$$

$$c_1 \left(\frac{\mathcal{E}'_{\varrho}(k-\delta_-)}{\Gamma(k+1)} - \frac{\Gamma'(k+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)^2} \mathcal{E}_{\varrho}(k-\delta_-) \right), \tag{5.36}$$

$$\mathcal{J}'_{\beta,\mu}(k) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\mu t^\beta - t} t^k \ln t \, dt, \quad \mathcal{E}'_{\varrho}(k) = \int_0^\varrho e^{-t} t^k \ln t \, dt,$$

and

$$\frac{\Gamma'(k+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)} = \ln k + \frac{1}{2k} + O(k^{-2}), \quad k \to \infty,$$

(see e.g. [1, Eq. 6.3.18]). Performing an asymptotic analysis similar to the one in the proof of the first part of the lemma, we find that there exists a function $\Psi = \Psi_{\beta,\mu,\delta}$ such that $\Psi(k) < 0$ for k large enough, and

$$\frac{\mathcal{J}'_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta)}{\Gamma(k+1)} - \frac{\Gamma'(k+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)^2} \mathcal{J}_{\beta,\mu}(k+\delta) = \Psi(k)(1+o(1)), \tag{5.37}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{E}'_{\varrho}(k-\delta_-)}{\Gamma(k+1)} - \frac{\Gamma'(k+1)}{\Gamma(k+1)^2} \mathcal{E}_{\varrho}(k-\delta_-) = o(\Psi(k)), \tag{5.38}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Putting together (5.36), (5.37), and (5.38), we conclude that $\mathcal{L}'(k) < 0$ for sufficiently large k. □

Taking into account the definition of the functions $\eta_{\gtrless,4}$ in (5.20) - (5.21), the mini-max principle, representation (4.29), as well as Lemma 5.3 (ii), we find that there exist constants $c_{j,\gtrless} > 0$, $j = 0, 1$, $\tilde{\delta}_{\gtrless} \in \mathbb{R}$, and $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_k(P_0 \eta_{<,4} P_0) &\geq \mathcal{L}_{\beta,\mu,\varrho,\tilde{\delta}_<}(k + k_0; c_{0,<}, -c_{1,<}), \\ \nu_k(P_0 \eta_{>,4} P_0) &\leq \mathcal{L}_{\beta,\mu,\varrho,\tilde{\delta}_>}(k; c_{0,>}, c_{1,>}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

for $\mu = \gamma(2/b)^\beta$, $\varrho = bR^2/2$, and sufficiently large $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$.
Putting together (5.1), (5.17), (5.18), (5.22), (5.39), and (5.24), we obtain (2.6) – (2.8).

6. Proof of Theorem 2.3

Estimates (3.4) combined with the Weyl inequalities (3.3) and the minimax principle, entail

$$n_+(\lambda(1+\varepsilon); P_qWP_q) + O(1) \leq$$
$$\mathcal{N}_q^-(\lambda) \leq$$

$$n_+(\lambda(1-\varepsilon)^2; P_qWP_q) + n_+(\lambda\varepsilon(1-\varepsilon); P_qWH_-^{-1}WP_q) + O(1), \tag{6.1}$$

$$n_+(\lambda(1+\varepsilon)^2; P_qWP_q) - n_+(\lambda\varepsilon(1+\varepsilon); P_qWH_+^{-1}WP_q) + O(1) \leq$$
$$\mathcal{N}_q^+(\lambda) \leq$$

$$n_+(\lambda(1-\varepsilon); P_qWP_q) + O(1), \tag{6.2}$$

as $\lambda \downarrow 0$. It is easy to check that we have

$$P_qWH_\pm^{-1}WP_q \leq C_{1,\pm}P_q\mathbb{A}^*\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}\mathbb{A}P_q$$

with

$$C_{1,\pm} := \|H_0^{1/2}H_\pm^{-1/2}\|^2 \left(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2}\langle x\rangle^\rho m_>(x)\right)^2.$$

Therefore, for any $s > 0$,

$$n_+(s; P_qWH_\pm^{-1}WP_q) \leq n_+(s; C_{1,\pm}P_q\mathbb{A}^*\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}\mathbb{A}P_q). \tag{6.3}$$

Further, by Proposition 4.1, the operator P_qWP_q (resp., $P_q\mathbb{A}^*\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}\mathbb{A}P_q$) is unitarily equivalent to $\frac{1}{2}P_0w_q(U)P_0$ (resp., to $P_0w_q(\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}I)P_0$). Hence, for any $s > 0$,

$$n_+(s; P_qWP_q) = n_+(2s; P_0w_q(U)P_0), \tag{6.4}$$

(6.5)
$$n_+(s; P_q\mathbb{A}^*\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}\mathbb{A}P_q) = n_+(s; P_0w_q\left(\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}I\right)P_0) \leq n_+(s; C_2P_0\langle\cdot\rangle^{-2\rho}P_0)$$

with $C_2 := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2}\langle x\rangle^{2\rho}|w_q(\langle x\rangle^{-2\rho}I)|$. Now, write

$$\frac{1}{2}w_q(U) = \mathcal{T}_q + \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q,$$

the symbol $\mathcal{T}_q$ being defined in (2.16), and note the crucial circumstance that $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_q \in \mathcal{S}^{-\rho-2}(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Then the Weyl inequalities (3.3) entail

$$n_+(s(1+\varepsilon); P_0\mathcal{T}_qP_0) - n_-(s\varepsilon; P_0\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_qP_0) \leq$$
$$n_+(2s; P_0w_q(U)P_0) \leq$$

$$n_+(s(1-\varepsilon); P_0\mathcal{T}_qP_0) + n_+(s\varepsilon; P_0\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_qP_0), \tag{6.6}$$

for any $s > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. Evidently,

$$n_\pm(s; P_0\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_qP_0) \leq n_+(s; C_3P_0\langle\cdot\rangle^{-\rho-2}P_0), \quad s > 0, \tag{6.7}$$

with $C_3 := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2}\langle x\rangle^{\rho+2}|\widetilde{\mathcal{T}}_q(x)|$. Recalling Proposition 4.3, we find that we have reduced the asymptotic analysis of $\mathcal{N}_q^{\pm}(\lambda)$ as $\lambda\downarrow 0$ to the eigenvalue asymptotics for a ΨDO with elliptic anti-Wick symbol of negative order. The spectral asymptotics for operators of this type has been extensively studied in the literature since the 1970s. In particular, we have the following

Proposition 6.1. *Let $0\leq\psi\in\mathcal{S}^{-\rho}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\rho>0$. Assume that there exists $0<\psi_0\in C^\infty(\mathbb{S}^1)$ such that $\lim_{|x|\to\infty}|x|^\rho\psi(x)=\psi_0(x/|x|)$. Then we have*

$$n_+(\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi))=(2\pi)^{-1}\Phi_\psi(\lambda)(1+o(1)),\quad \lambda\downarrow 0, \tag{6.8}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\lambda^{2/\rho}n_+(\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi))=\mathcal{C}(\psi_0):=\frac{1}{4\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\psi_0(\cos\theta,\sin\theta)^{2/\rho}d\theta.$$

Proof. Evidently, for each $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$ there exist real functions $\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon}\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that

$$\psi_{-,\varepsilon}(x)\leq\psi(x)\leq\psi_{+,\varepsilon}(x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^2,$$
$$\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon}(x)=(1\mp\varepsilon)^{-1}|x|^{-\rho}\psi_0(x/|x|),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^2,\quad |x|\geq R,$$

for some $R\in(0,\infty)$. Applying the monotonicity of the anti-Wick quantization with respect to the symbol (see e.g. [35, Proposition 24.1]), the mini-max principle, and the Weyl inequalities, we obtain

$$n_+((1+\varepsilon)\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{-,\varepsilon}))-n_-(\varepsilon\lambda;(\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi_{-,\varepsilon})-\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{-,\varepsilon})))\leq$$
$$n_+(\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi))\leq$$
$$n_+((1-\varepsilon)\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{+,\varepsilon}))+n_+(\varepsilon\lambda;(\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi_{+,\varepsilon})-\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{+,\varepsilon}))). \tag{6.9}$$

By [14], we have the following semiclassical result

$$n_+(\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon}))=(2\pi)^{-1}\Phi_{\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon}}(\lambda)(1+o(1)),\quad \lambda\downarrow 0. \tag{6.10}$$

Further, by [35, Theorem 24.1] the differences $\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon})-\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon})$ are ΨDOs of lower order than $\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon})$, so that we easily obtain

$$\lim_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\lambda^{2/\rho}n_\pm(\varepsilon\lambda;(\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon})-\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{w}}(\psi_{\pm,\varepsilon}))=0,\quad \varepsilon>0. \tag{6.11}$$

Now, (6.9) – (6.11) imply

$$(1+\varepsilon)^{-4/\rho}\mathcal{C}(\psi_0)\leq\liminf_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\lambda^{2/\rho}n_+(\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi))\leq$$
$$\limsup_{\lambda\downarrow 0}\lambda^{2/\rho}n_+(\lambda;\mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\psi))\leq(1-\varepsilon)^{-4/\rho}\mathcal{C}(\psi_0),$$

for $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$. Letting $\varepsilon\downarrow 0$, we obtain (6.8).

□

By Propositions 4.3 and 6.1, we have

$$n_+(\lambda; P_0\mathcal{T}_q P_0) = n_+(\lambda; \mathrm{Op}^{\mathrm{aw}}(\mathcal{T}_{q,b})) =$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\Phi_{\mathcal{T}_{q,b}}(\lambda)(1+o(1)) = \frac{b}{2\pi}\Phi_{\mathcal{T}_q}(\lambda)(1+o(1)), \quad \lambda \downarrow 0, \tag{6.12}$$

with $\mathcal{T}_{q,b} = \mathcal{T}_q \circ \mathcal{R}_b$, $\mathcal{R}_b$ being defined in (4.31). Finally, for $\rho_0 > \rho$, we have

$$n_+(\lambda; P_0\langle\cdot\rangle^{-\rho_0}P_0) = O(\lambda^{-2/\rho_0}) = o(\Phi_{\mathcal{T}_q}(\lambda)), \quad \lambda \downarrow 0. \tag{6.13}$$

Now, (2.17) easily follows from (6.1) – (6.8), (6.12), and (6.13). The equivalence of (2.18) and (2.19) can be checked by arguing as in the proof of [35, Proposition 13.1].

Appendix A. Compactness of the Resolvent Differences

A priori, the operators H_0 and $H_\pm$, self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$, could be defined as the Friedrichs extensions of the operators $\sum_{j=1,2}\Pi_j^2$ and $\sum_{j,k=1,2}\Pi_j g_{jk}^{\pm}\Pi_k$ defined on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Such a definition implies immediately that

$$\mathrm{Dom}\, H_0^{1/2} = \mathrm{Dom}\, H_\pm^{1/2} = \left\{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \,|\, \Pi_j u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2),\ j=1,2\right\},$$

and that the operators $H_\pm^{1/2}H_0^{-1/2}$ and $H_0^{1/2}H_\pm^{-1/2}$ are bounded. By [20, Proposition A.2], the operators H_0 and $H_\pm$ are essentially self-adjoint on $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, and have a common domain

$$\mathrm{Dom}\, H_0 = \mathrm{Dom}\, H_\pm = \left\{u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) \,|\, \Pi_j\Pi_k u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2),\ j,k=1,2\right\}.$$

Let us now prove the compactness of the operator $H_0^{-1} - H_\pm^{-1}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Since we have

$$H_0^{-1} - H_\pm^{-1} = \pm H_0^{-1}WH_\pm^{-1} = \pm H_0^{-1}WH_0^{-1}H_0H_\pm^{-1},$$

it suffices to prove the compactness of $H_0^{-1}WH_0^{-1}$. The operators $H_0^{-1}WH_0^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}H_0^{-1}\mathbb{A}^*U\mathbb{A}H_0^{-1}$ and $\frac{1}{2}H_0^{-1}\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}H_0^{-1}$ are bounded, self-adjoint, and positive. Moreover,

$$H_0^{-1}\mathbb{A}^*U\mathbb{A}H_0^{-1} \le H_0^{-1}\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}H_0^{-1}. \tag{A.1}$$

On the other hand,

$$H_0^{-1}\mathbb{A}^*m_>\mathbb{A}H_0^{-1} = H_0^{-1}a^*m_>aH_0^{-1} + H_0^{-1}am_>a^*H_0^{-1}. \tag{A.2}$$

By (A.1) and (A.2), it suffices to prove the compactness of the operator $m_>^{1/2}a^*H_0^{-1}$. We have

$$m_>^{1/2}a^*H_0^{-1} = m_>^{1/2}H_0^{-1/2}\left(H_0^{-1/2}a^* + 2bH_0^{-1/2}a^*H_0^{-1}\right).$$

The operator $H_0^{-1/2}a^* + 2bH_0^{-1/2}a^*H_0^{-1}$ is bounded, so that it suffices to prove the compactness of $m_>^{1/2}H_0^{-1/2}$ which follows from $m_> \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\lim_{|x|\to\infty} m_>(x) = 0$, and the diamagnetic inequality (see e.g. [4, Theorem 2.5]).

Acknowledgements. The final version of this work has been done during authors' visit to the Isaac Newton Institute, Cambridge, UK, in January 2015. The authors thank the Newton Institute for financial support and hospitality. The partial support by the Chilean Scientific Foundation *Fondecyt* under Grant 1130591, by *Núcleo Milenio de Física Matemática* RC120002, and by the Faculty of Mathematics, PUC, Santiago de Chile, is gratefully acknowledged as well.

References

[1] M.Abramowitz, I.Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, National Bureau of Standards, Applied Mathematics Series **55**, 1964.

[2] S. Alama, M. Avellaneda, P. A. Deift, R. Hempel, *On the existence of eigenvalues of a divergence-form operator $A + \lambda B$ in a gap of $\sigma(A)$*, Asymptotic Anal. **8** (1994), 311-344.

[3] S. Alama, P. A. Deift, R. Hempel, *Eigenvalue branches of the Schrödinger operator $H - \lambda W$ in a gap of $\sigma(H)$*, Comm. Math. Phys. **121** (1989), 291-321.

[4] J. Avron, I. Herbst, B. Simon, *Schrödinger operators with magnetic fields. I. General interactions*, Duke Math. J. **45** (1978), 847-883.

[5] G. Bastard, J. K. Furdyna, J. Mycielski, *Landau levels and cyclotron resonance in graded mixed semiconductors*, Phys. Review B, **12** (1975), 4356-4359.

[6] M.Š.Birman, M.Z.Solomjak, *Spectral Theory of Self-Adjoint Operators in Hilbert Space*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, 1987.

[7] J.-F. Bony, V. Bruneau, G. Raikov, *Resonances and spectral shift function singularities for magnetic quantum Hamiltonians*, In: Proceedings of the Conference Spectral and Scattering Theory and Related Topics, Kyoto, 2011, RIMS Kokyuroku Bessatsu **B45** (2014), 77-100.

[8] A. Boulkhemair, *L^2 estimates for Weyl quantization*. J. Funct. Anal. **165** (1999), 173–204.

[9] S. I. Boyarchenko, S. Z. Levendorski, *An asymptotic formula for the number of eigenvalue branches of a divergence form operator $A + \lambda B$ in a spectral gap of A*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **22** (1997), 1771-1786.

[10] Ph. Briet, H. Kovařík, G. Raikov, E. Soccorsi, *Eigenvalue asymptotics in a twisted waveguide*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **34** (2009), 818-836.

[11] V. Bruneau, A. Pushnitski, G. D. Raikov, *Spectral shift function in strong magnetic fields*, Algebra i Analiz **16** (2004), 207–238; see also St. Petersburg Math. J. **16** (2005), 181–209.

[12] Y. Colin de Verdière, *L'asymptotique de Weyl pour les bouteilles magnétiques*, Comm. Math. Phys. **105** (1986), 327-335.

[13] J.-M.Combes, P.D.Hislop, F.Klopp, G.D.Raikov, *Global continuity of the integrated density of states for random Landau Hamiltonians*, Commun. P.D.E. **29** (2004), 1187-1213.

[14] M. Dauge, D. Robert, *Weyl's formula for a class of pseudodifferential operators with negative order on* $L^2(\mathbf{R}^n)$, Pseudodifferential operators (Oberwolfach, 1986), 91-122, Lecture Notes in Math., **1256**, Springer, Berlin, 1987.

[15] A. de Souza Dutra, J. A. de Oliveira, *Two-dimensional position-dependent massive particles in the presence of magnetic fields*, J. Phys. A **42** (2009), no. 2, 025304, 13 pp.

[16] C.Fernández, G.D.Raikov, *On the singularities of the magnetic spectral shift function at the Landau levels*, Ann. H. Poincaré **5** (2004), 381–403.

[17] N. Filonov, A. Pushnitski, *Spectral asymptotics of Pauli operators and orthogonal polynomials in complex domains*, Comm. Math. Phys. **264** (2006), 759-772.

[18] V. Fock, *Bemerkung zur Quantelung des harmonischen Oszillators im Magnetfeld*, Z. Physik **47** (1928), 446–448.

[19] M. Gadella, O. G. Smolyanov, *Feynman formulas for particles with position-dependent mass* (Russian) Dokl. Akad. Nauk **418** (2008), 727–730; English translation in Dokl. Math. **77** (2008), 120-123.

[20] C. Gérard, A. Martinez, J. Sjöstrand, *A mathematical approach to the effective Hamiltonian in perturbed periodic problems* Comm. Math. Phys. **142** (1991), 217-244.

[21] I. S.Gradshteyn, I. M.Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series, and Products*, Academic Press, New York, 1965.

[22] V. Ivrii, *Microlocal Analysis and Precise Spectral Asymptotics*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[23] J. P. Killingbeck, *The Schrödinger equation with position-dependent mass*, J. Phys. A **44** (2011), no. 28, 285208, 6 pp.

[24] L. Landau, *Diamagnetismus der Metalle*, Z. Physik **64** (1930), 629–637.

[25] N. S. Landkof, *Foundations of Modern Potential Theory*, Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, **180**, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1972.

[26] Sh. Mao, *Singularities for solutions to Schrödinger equations with asymptotically constant magnetic fields*, J. Math. Phys. **53** (2012), 073707, 15 pp.

[27] B. Midya, B. Roy, R. Roychoudhury, *Position dependent mass Schrödinger equation and isospectral potentials: intertwining operator approach*, J. Math. Phys. **51** (2010), no. 2, 022109, 23 pp.

[28] A. Pushnitski, G. D. Raikov, C. Villegas–Blas, *Asymptotic density of eigenvalue clusters for the perturbed Landau Hamiltonian*, Commun. Math. Phys., **320** (2013), 425–453.

[29] A. Pushnitski, G. Rozenblum, *On the spectrum of Bargmann-Toeplitz operators with symbols of a variable sign*, J. Anal. Math. **114** (2011), 317-340.

[30] G. D. Raikov, *Eigenvalue asymptotics for the Schrödinger operator with homogeneous magnetic potential and decreasing electric potential. I. Behaviour near the essential spectrum tips*, Commun. P.D.E. **15** (1990), 407–434; Errata: Commun. P.D.E. **18** (1993), 1977–1979.

[31] G. D. Raikov, *Spectral asymptotics for waveguides with perturbed periodic twisting*, ArXiV Preprint 1407.0757 (2014) (to appear in J. Spectral Theory).
[32] G. Raikov, S. Warzel, *Quasi-classical versus non-classical spectral asymptotics for magnetic Schrödinger operators with decreasing electric potentials*, Rev. Math. Phys. **14** (2002), 1051–1072.
[33] S. Rosenberg, *The Laplacian on a Riemannian Manifold*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, **31** Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
[34] G. Rozenblum, G. Tashchiyan, *On the spectral properties of the perturbed Landau Hamiltonian*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **33** (2008), 1048-1081.
[35] M.A.Shubin, *Pseudodifferential Operators and Spectral Theory*, Second Edition, Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag, 2001.
[36] S. Sternberg, *Lectures on Differential Geometry*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
[37] O. von Roos, *Position-dependent effective masses in semiconductor theory*, Phys. Review B, **27** (1983), 7547–7552.

Tomás Lungenstrass, Georgi Raikov
Facultad de Matemáticas
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile
Vicuña Mackenna 4860
Santiago de Chile
E-mails: tlungens@mat.puc.cl, graikov@mat.puc.cl